

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended to make clear that the base section and the transverse section are planar sections. With this clarification it is believed that independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes from newly cited United States Patent No. 6,072,235 issued to Rehnelt et al. and similar French Patent No. 2,761,852.


For a prior patent to anticipate a claimed invention, the patent must disclose each and every limitation of the claim. Rehnelt et al. is devoid of the claimed planar base and the claimed planar transverse section. The base of Rehnelt et al. is not planar but rather has "a bridge-shaped elevated middle portion." See Abstract, lines 1,2; Col. 1, lines 60-61 and Col. 2, lines 2-3. This elevated portion is illustrated by reference numeral 5 in the drawings. The presence of the elevated portion between the vertical printed circuit board and the mother board is significant because there is everywhere an air gap between the vertical board and the motherboard which adds thermal and electrical impedance between the two boards. Such a bent portion would also make it very difficult to fabricate present applicants' easily fabricated structure.

Similarly, Rehnelt, et al. is devoid of the planar transverse section called for in claim 1. The upright portions 6 of Rehnelt are clearly not planar. (See drawings). They are contoured to clamp the upright circuit. See Col. 2, lines 32-33. Such contouring reduces the contact area, increases thermal and electrical impedance and reduces the area available for solder joining. Accordingly, Rehnelt et al. does not anticipate claim 1 or the remaining claims dependent thereon. Applicant's claims distinguish from the structure shown in French Patent 2,761,852 for the same reasons.

Nor do these references make obvious the invention of claim 1. They are devoid of any teaching or suggestion that their elevated, bent and clamping structures should be modified to planar structures. Indeed they teach away from any requirements for planarity. Accordingly, they do not make obvious the invention of claim 1 or the remaining claims dependent thereon.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application fully complies with the provisions of 35 U.S.C. Sections 102 and 103 and is now in condition for allowance. Favorable action in this regard is therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,


Glen E. Books
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

Reg. No. 24,950

DOCKET ADMINISTRATOR
Lowenstein Sandler PC
65 Livingston Avenue
Roseland, NJ 07068